

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/772,841	Applicant(s) PRATT, CHRISTOPHER ARNOLD	
	Examiner Daniel P. Stephenson	Art Unit 3672	

All Participants:

Status of Application: allowed

(1) Daniel P. Stephenson.

(3) _____.

(2) Celia Leber.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 December 2006

Time: 4:00

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was related to the applicant that the case was in condition for allowance with the exception of one minor issue that the examiner had with the claims. It was put forth by the examiner that in the amended claims the latch mechanism that was "operable to couple the tie-back assembly to the main casing" could be broadly read. This could lead one to view the Ohmer et al. reference as anticipating the claims. The mechanism (44) that attaches the liner/tie-back to the whipstock allows for an indirect coupling between the tie-back and the casing. The examiner put forth the suggestion that the terms be changed to "operable to couple the tie-back assembly directly to the main casing" in each of the independent claims. Support for this change can be found in Figures 3 and 4 (400), and in the specification on page 10 lines 4-10. The applicant agreed to these changes. The examiner also informed the applicant that the claims 57, 59 and 60 directed to the non-elected species II would be rejoined since they contained all the limitations of the allowable generic claim. However, claims 41-50 would be cancelled as directed to the non-elected species without including the particulars of the generic claimed. In addition, claim 63 was dependent from cancelled claim 62. This could be changed to be dependent from claim 61 with an examiner's amendment. The applicant agreed to these changes.